London Borough of Islington

Planning Committee - 13 September 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber - Town Hall on 13 September 2016 at 7.30 pm.

Present:	**Councillors:**	Robert Khan (Chair), Martin Klute (Vice-Chair), Alice Donovan (Vice-Chair), Jilani Chowdhury, Paul Convery, Tim Nicholls, David Poyser, Una O'Halloran, Angela Picknell and Nick Ward
Also Present:	**Councillors:**	Diarmaid Ward

Councillor Robert Khan in the Chair

227 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

Councillor Khan welcomed everyone to the meeting. Members of the Committee and officers introduced themselves and the Chair outlined the procedures for the meeting.

228 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

There were no apologies for absence.

229 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

There were no declarations of substitute members.

230 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

231 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be B2, B3 and B1.

232 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2016 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

233 273 CAMDEN ROAD, LONDON, N7 0JN (Item B1)

Demolition of existing building and erection of a 6 storey building to provide 21 residential units (8 x 1 bed, 12 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bedroom flats) with associated landscaping and amenity space.

(Planning application number: P2015/5306/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer stated that a condition should be added to require a bat survey to be undertaken.

- Concern was raised that the proposal did not have shared cores for private units, intermediate units and social rented units. The applicant confirmed that they were separate to reduce service charges for the social rented units.

Councillor Khan proposed a motion to defer the consideration of the application to enable the further viability assessments on having a shared core and two core options to be independently assessed. This was seconded by Councillor Klute and carried.

RESOLVED:
That consideration of the application be deferred for the reason outlined above.

234 **68-86 FARRINGDON ROAD, LONDON, EC1R 0BD (Item B2)**

Demolition of existing multi-storey car park and redevelopment to provide a part 5 (plus basement)/ part 6-storey building comprising 3647sqm (GEA) office floorspace (Class B1 use), 180 bedroom hotel (Class C1 use) and 407sqm (GEA) retail/restaurant floorspace (Class A1/A3 use) with associated facilities, plant, landscaping and servicing.

(Planning application number: P2015/1958/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer stated that Paragraph 10.149 of the report should refer to one disabled space and the proposed works outside the site referred to in Paragraph 10.152 had been removed from the application in the revised plans.
- Policy stated that hotels should only be placed in town centres or within 300m of national railway hubs. Concern was raised that the site was not in either.
- The Local Site Allocations Document promoted business, retail and residential uses. Consideration was given as to whether a hotel was a departure from policy.
- The materials to be used and the location of the windows were discussed.
- Concern was raised that there was no housing provision and that the proposal would limit the achievement of other development plan priorities such as housing growth.
- The planning officer advised that social housing had not been included in the proposals as it was not viable. There was however a contribution to off-site provision.
- The planning officer stated that the hotel rooms provided transient short term accommodation and therefore the lighting level to the rooms was adequate. The design of the windows minimised overlooking of neighbouring buildings.
- Concern was raised that overlooking was still an issue.
- The planning officer advised that the design had been discussed with the design and conservation officers at length and the design review panel comments had been taken into account in the design.
- Concern was raised that the hotel would only provide 50 jobs.
- A member stated that the Finsbury Local Plan included this site as one grouped with three others. Together they were expected to provide housing and this site did not provide any.
- Concern was raised that viability seemed to be the only argument put forward for not conforming with policy and the land valuation seemed to have been significantly inflated.

Councillor Khan proposed a motion to refuse planning permission due to the poor design, lack of adequate cycle parking, cycle paths and inadequate delivery and servicing arrangements and the proposed use as a hotel not being policy compliant. This was seconded by Councillor Donovan and carried.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out above, the wording of which was delegated to officers in consultation with the chair.

235 **SHIRE HOUSE WHITBREAD CENTRE [INCLUDING CAR PARK AND SERVICE YARD], 11 LAMB'S PASSAGE, LONDON, EC1Y 8TE (FULL APPLICATION) (Item B3)**

Demolition of existing works building and redevelopment of the existing surface level car park, along with the conversion of existing Grade II listed underground vaults, to provide a mixed use development comprising of a 4 to 7 storey building providing 35 residential units (15 affordable and 20 market rate) (Class C3), a 61 bedroom hotel (Class C1), office floorspace (Class B1a), restaurant (Class A3), retail (Class A1) and gym (Class D2), along with the creation of new public realm, associated landscaping and alterations to the existing access arrangements.

(Planning application number: P2016/0488/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer advised that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) figures in the officer report had changed and were now £534,309 for the Mayoral CIL and £2,347,768 for the Islington CIL.
- The planning officer stated that the applicant had signed the statutory declaration confirming that the scheme would be deliverable with the level of obligations set out in the report as well as the CIL of £534,309 for the Mayoral CIL and £2,347,768 for the Islington CIL.
- The planning officer stated that reference to a need to meet in full the carbon offset contribution should be added into the second bullet point of Recommendation A in Appendix 1 of the officer report.
- Concern was raised by a member that the £600,000 to be spent by the developer on marketing the scheme was excessive. The BPS representative and the applicant stated that this was in line with the market norms.
- Concern was raised that the viability was based on generic sums. A member suggested that marketing would not be necessary in the area in which the proposed development was located and the hotel would not need to marketed as an operator had been found.
- Members raised concern over the principle of introducing a hotel at the site.
- The planning officer advised that the adopted site allocation policy was specifically worded so as to allow a hotel at the site and development plan policy identified the site as suitable in principle for a hotel. The planning officer advised that in the previous appeal decision, the inspector had not raised concern over the principle of the inclusion of a hotel. The presence of a hotel and the jobs it would create were cited as one of the benefits of the proposal.
- Concern was raised that there might be an overconcentration of hotels in the area. The applicant stated that their hotel consultant had conducted an analysis to establish the demand level, see whether a hotel would be viable or whether there would be overconcentration.
- In response to a question from the chair, the legal officer advised that the inspector's decision was a material consideration as was anything material which had happened since the inspector's decision. Therefore any newly consented hotels since the appeal decision could be taken into account.
- Concern was raised that if the committee approved the development without context it could be approving a development which was not policy compliant. The legal officer advised that if the committee felt it had insufficient information, it could defer the consideration of the application for more information.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to defer the consideration of the application to receive the full report on the analysis that had been undertaken to establish the hotel demand level in the area and to establish if there would be an overconcentration of hotels or similar uses as set out in Policy DM4.11. This was seconded by Councillor O'Halloran and carried.

RESOLVED:
That consideration of the application be deferred for the reasons outlined above the wording of which was delegated to officers.

236 **SHIRE HOUSE WHITBREAD CENTRE [INCLUDING CAR PARK AND SERVICE YARD], 11 LAMB'S PASSAGE, LONDON, EC1Y 8TE (LISTED BUILDING APPLICATION) (Item B4)**

Demolition of existing works building and redevelopment of the existing surface level car park, along with the conversion of existing Grade II listed underground vaults, to provide a mixed use development comprising of a 4 to 7 storey building providing 35 residential units (15 affordable and 20 market rate) (Class C3), a 61 bedroom hotel (Class C1), office floorspace (Class B1a), restaurant (Class A3), retail (Class A1) and gym (Class D2), along with the creation of new public realm, associated landscaping and alterations to the existing access arrangements.

(Planning application number: P2016/0536/LBC)

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to defer the consideration of this application pending the consideration of further information on the associated full planning application P2016/0488/FUL to receive the full report on the analysis that had been undertaken to establish the hotel demand level in the area, and to establish if there would be an overconcentration of hotels or similar uses as set out in Policy DM4.11. This was seconded by Councillor O'Halloran and carried.

RESOLVED:
That consideration of the application be deferred for the reason outlined above.

The meeting ended at 9.45 pm

CHAIR